

### **STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-27 were originally filed in this patent application. In response to a first office action dated 04/19/2006, an amendment was filed on 07/19/2006 that cancelled claims 16-17, 21-22 and 24-25 and amended claims 15, 20 and 23. In response to a second office action dated 10/04/2006, a Request for Reconsideration was filed on 01/04/2007. In the pending office action, claims 1-15, 18-20, 23 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,675 to Graves *et al.* (hereinafter “Graves”). No claim was allowed. Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 23, and 26-27 have been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 19-20 are currently pending.

## REMARKS

### Rejection of claims 1-15, 18-20, 23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The examiner rejected claims 1-15, 18-20, 23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Graves. Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 23, and 26-27 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Each of the remaining claims is addressed below.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite the limitations of former claim 2, which has been cancelled. In rejecting claim 2, the examiner states Graves teaches all of these limitations. Graves teaches delaying processing a plurality a plurality of received queries, as stated by the examiner. Claim 1 as amended, however, does not delay processing a plurality of received queries. Claim 1 as amended expressly recites processing a first query to generate a first result set by interrogating the database, and while the first query is being processed (including interrogating the database), at least one other query is received and evaluated to determine whether the at least one other query is satisfied by the first result set, wherein the database query processor returns the first result set to the first query and uses the first result set to generate at least one other result set for any of the at least one other query that is satisfied by the first result set without caching the first result set and without interrogating the database for the at least one other query. Graves teaches aggregating multiple queries and executing a single query that satisfies the multiple queries that are aggregated together before any query is executed. Claim 1 as amended, in contrast, executes a first query by interrogating the database to generate a first result set, then uses the first result set to generate at least one other result set. Graves aggregates multiple queries into a single aggregate query. The single aggregate query in Graves can only satisfy the queries that were received ***before*** creating the single aggregate query. Claim 1, in contrast, processes a first query to generate a first result set by interrogating the database, and while the query is being processed (*i.e.*, after execution of the query has begun), receives one or more other queries, and may satisfy these one or more other queries received while the first query is being processed using the first result set without caching the first result set and without interrogating the database for the one or more other queries. The generation of a single

aggregate query in Graves based on a set of queries that are all received before execution of the aggregate query expressly teaches away from the limitations in claim 1 as amended. As a result, claim 1 is allowable over Graves, and applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

### Claim 3

Claim 3 depends on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 3 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

### Claim 4

Claim 4 includes many limitations similar to those in claim 1 addressed above, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons given above for claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

### Claim 8

Claim 8 is a method claim with limitations similar to those in claim 1, which is addressed above. As a result, claim 8 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

### Claim 10

Claim 10 depends on claim 8, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 10 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

#### Claim 11

Claim 11 is a method claim with limitations similar to those in claim 4, which is addressed above. As a result, claim 11 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 4. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

#### Claim 15

Claim 15 is a program product claim with limitations similar to those in claim 1, which is addressed above. As a result, claim 15 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

#### Claim 19

Claim 19 depends on claim 15 which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 19 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

#### Claim 20

Claim 20 is a program product claim with limitations similar to those in claim 4, which is addressed above. As a result, claim 20 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 4. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

## Conclusion

In summary, Graves does not teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /derekpmartin/  
Derek P. Martin  
Reg. No. 36,595

**MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.**  
P.O. Box 548  
Carthage, MO 64836-0548  
(417) 358-4700